notifications issued by Ministry of Finance on 28.2.93, copies of which are available in the Parliament Library.

The prices of scheduled bulk drugs/formulations are revised from time to time after taking account the latest rates of customs duty etc. The exercise of revising the prices of scheduled bulk drugs due to impact of reduced customs duty is going on. The prices of formulations based on such bulk drugs would also be reduced correspondingly.

(e) No, Sir.

(f) Does not arise.

**Consumption of drugs and expenditure on Research and Development**

1909. SHRI RAMDAS AGARWAL: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that despite the tremendous growth of Drug Industry, the average per capita consumption of medicines in India is Rs. 41/- per year which is one of the lowest consumptions in the world;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the current spending on Research and Development of the drug industry is only around 2 per cent of its turnover in India while the international drug industry spent nearly 12 per cent of their turnover on Research and Development;

(c) if so, what steps Government propose to take so that our new policy on Drugs becomes pragmatic one, in tune with the liberalised industrial policy and to ensure abundent availability of drugs at reasonable price to common man; and

(d) by when the new Drug Policy is likely to be announced as its delay is hampering the very existence of drug industry; and what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) and (b) These estimations are broadly correct.

(c) and (d) A Background Note on Review of Drug Policy, 1986 has been placed on the Table of the House on 12.8.1992 for discussion.

**Disciplinary proceedings manual of IDPL**

1910. SHRIMATI SARALA MAHESHWARI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the reply given to the Unstarred Question 2262 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 30th July, 1992 and state:

(a) what is the reasonable time period prescribed to institute disciplinary proceedings and to issue charge sheet;

(b) whether IDPL had followed the rule number 11(5)(2) of the disciplinary proceedings manual and the 32(2)(a) of leave rules for Central Government employees while taking disciplinary action against its employees if not, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether rule 14(4) and rule 14(23)(5) of the said disciplinary proceedings manual were kept in mind by the IDPL manangement while issuing charge sheets to permanent employees, if not the reasons therefor;

(d) whether the disciplinary proceedings were completed, if not the reasons therefor; and

(e) what are the details of the guidelines of "proper sanctioning/refusal of leave" existing in IDPL and its implementation on its employees with reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) This has not been defined under the conduct rules. It may vary from case to case depending upon the attendent circumstances. Charge-sheet is not issued automatically or mechanically as application of the mind of the disciplinary authority in considering the entire facts and circumstances is a pre-condition for such disciplinary action.

(b) and (c) The reference is apparently to the provisions in the disciplinary for Central Government employees. As IDPL has its own Conduct, Discipline and Appeal Rules, the rules as applicable to the Central Government employyes, are not applicable to employees of IDPL. Rule 32(2)(a) of the CCS (Leave Rules), 1972 is not applicable in the case of unauthorised absence from duty.

(d) Disciplinary proceedings against the concerned employees were completed or concluded or extinguished as the case may be.

(e) Leave is not a matter of right. It is a privilege subject to sanction by the competent authority. Leave is treated as sanctioned upon issuance of an Officer Order to that effect. When an employee is informed that leave has not been sanctioned, it is leave refused. This is the standard procedure followed in IDPL.

**Refusal to supply the copy of IDPL rules**

1911. SHRI ASHIS SEN: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to reply to the Unstarred Question 4598 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 20th August, 1992 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the IDPL management refused to supply the copy of the IDPL Rules (CDA) to the charged employees when they demanded for it before replying to their charge sheets, if so, the reasons therefor;

(b) whether it is a fact that the company deliberately appointed the wrong disciplinary authority in order to gain time so that new impunged rule 30-A should be incorporated in the rules books for summarily proceedings with the reasons therefor;

(c) whether it is a fact that despite contemplated the disciplinary proceedings the management denied even the subsistence allowances as per rule 20 of IDPL, CDA Rules and forced them to face the enquiry without it, if so, the reasons thereof; and

(d) whether IDPL was avoiding conducting enquiries under rule 25 of IDPL, CDA against the said employees, if so, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) The employees referred to is a former Marketing Executive of IDPL. In the matter of such employees, the management of the company is the authority competent to take a decision. As reported by IDPL, it is not correct that the management refused to supply a copy of the Conduct, Discipline and Appeal Rules to the said former Marketing Executive.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) The said former Marketing Executive was on unauthorised absence. He was not placed under suspension. He was not entitled to any subsistence allowance.

(d) This is not correct the said employee himself was adopting dilatory tactics to prolong proceedings under Rule 25.

**Unauthorised absence from duty**

1912. SHRI M. A. BABY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 4598 given in the Rajya Sabha on 20th August, 1992 and state:

(a) whether disciplinary procedure in case of unauthorised absence from duty for four days and less than 30 days under Rule 25 of IDPL, CDA Rules was applied on the employees, against whom disciplinary proceedings were instituted:

(b) whether under Rule 20 of IDPL, CDA Rules the employees against whom disciplinory proceedings were pending of contemplated for unauthorised absence, were suspended or not, together with the reasons therefor:

(c) whether it is a fact that the employees were denied all allowances even the subsistence, with the reasons therefor; and